

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 have been examined on their merits.

Applicants herein cancel claim 14 without prejudice and/or disclaimer.

Claims 1-13 and 15-23 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

1. Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (1<sup>st</sup> para.) as allegedly being based on a disclosure that is non-enabling. The rejection of claim 14 is now moot due to its cancellation. Applicants traverse the § 112 (1<sup>st</sup> para.) rejection of claims 1-13 and 15-23 for at least the reasons discussed below.

Applicants herein amend independent claims 1, 8, 21 and 23 to recite an auxiliary double-convex lens positioned in an optical path that has a magnifying power similar to the lens system. Applicants submit that the § 112 (1<sup>st</sup> para.) rejection of claims 1-13 and 15-23 has been overcome, and respectfully request that the Patent Office reconsider and withdraw the § 112 (1<sup>st</sup> para.) rejection of claims 1-13 and 15-23.

2. Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (2<sup>nd</sup> para.) as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential elements. The rejection of claim 14 is now moot due to its cancellation. Applicants traverse the § 112 (2<sup>nd</sup> para.) rejection of claims 1-13 and 15-23 for at least the reasons discussed below.

Applicants herein amend independent claims 1, 8, 21 and 23 to recite an auxiliary double-convex lens positioned in an optical path that has a magnifying power similar to the lens system. Applicants submit that the § 112 (2<sup>nd</sup> para.) rejection of claims 1-13 and 15-23 has been

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. Application No. 10/779,859

overcome, and respectfully request that the Patent Office reconsider and withdraw the § 112 (2<sup>nd</sup> para.) rejection of claims 1-13 and 15-23.

3. Claims 1, 8, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Sakamoto *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,342). Applicants traverse the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 8, 20 and 21 for at least the reasons discussed below.

Sakamoto *et al.* fail to teach or suggest at least an auxiliary double-convex lens positioned in an optical path that has a magnifying power similar to that of the lens system, as recited in each of independent claims 1, 8, 20 and 21. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1, 8, 20 and 21 are allowable, and respectfully request that the Patent Office reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 8, 20 and 21.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. Application No. 10/779,859

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Paul F. Neils", written over a horizontal line.

Paul F. Neils  
Registration No. 33,102

Date: December 13, 2005

Attorney Docket No.: Q79849